

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.ospto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,746	01/12/2000	JEAN-GERARD SAINT-RAMON	6005-4018	5467
75	90 06/04/2003			
MORGAN & FINNEGAN			EXAMINER	
345 PARK AVI NEW YORK, N	· -		DEAK, LESLIE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	1
			DATE MAILED: 06/04/2003	13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			bC-
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/462,746	SAINT-RAMON ET	AL.
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie R. Deak	3762	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe		·	
THE REPLY FILED 20 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a sinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of the state	nis application. A proper re ment which places the appli	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>EPLY</u> [check either a) or	. p)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	nan SIX MONTHS from the ma FILED WITHIN TWO MONT	iling date of the final rejection. HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. \$	See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three manned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding and statutory period for reply origing.	nount of the fee. The appropriate extending set in the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 			
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appea	l by materially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding nu	mber of finally rejected clair	ns.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.	ction(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitt	ed in a separate, timely filed	d amendment
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request fo application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		een considered but does NC	OT place the
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed s	SOLELY to issues which we	re newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
B.☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Exam	iiner.
D. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure StatemeO. ☐ Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	Ongel D	Spy
αl , z		Congai Ze	1
21 1 June 03		ANGELA D. SYKES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM	AINED
Patent and Trademark Office		TO SALL OF THE SAL	mttll

PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Advisory Action

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 37005

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented do not simplyfy the items at issue in the case. Specifically, applicant argues that the filler passage is structurally different than the drain passage, but recites only the intended use of the drain passage, omitting any limitations that affect the structure of the passage itself. Therefore, the instantly claimed invention is not patentable over the prior art of record.